



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

❖THE❖OLD❖TESTAMENT❖STUDENT.❖

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1884.

NO. I.

A RECENT THEORY OF THE GARDEN OF EDEN.*

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

It is not the purpose of this article to give, even in outline, an account of the various hypotheses in regard to the position of Eden and its garden which have found champions at different periods in the history of exegetical studies.† But since a degree of new life has been awakened in the discussion since the beginning of the present decade, it seems worth the while to review one of its most striking phases with the purpose of determining, if possible, the net result.

The immediate and most effective cause of revived interest in a debate which had been long-continued and somewhat fruitless was the appearance, soon after the middle of 1881, of the monograph, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, by the brilliant Assyriologist of Leipzig. His views had been propounded some three or four years earlier in a paper read before the Leipzig *Verein fuer Erdkunde*, but were now published in a much more extended form, and fortified by great learning and ingenious argument. The essential mark of his theory was the location of Eden in Northern Babylonia, and the identification of the various features of the Biblical account (Gen. II., 8-14) with the aid of Babylonian topography and the products of Babylonian soil. This striking hypothesis, so vigorously presented, called forth a wide expression of opinion. Most of the notices which appeared in English and American publications were of a favorable nature,—some, indeed, with considerable reservations,—but, unfortunately for their scientific value, there was in several prominent cases a lack of discrimination, and an indication of prepossession, which diminished their real importance.

* Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Paradies*, Leipzig, 1881. Cf. S. I. Curtiss, in *Symposium on the Antediluvian Narratives*,—Lenormant, Delitzsch, Haupt, Dillmann;—*Bib. Sacra*, July, 1883.

† This field has often been surveyed: *vid.* Winer, *Real-Woerterbuch*; Schenkel, *Bibel-Lexicon*; Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*; Dillmann, *Genesis*; Friedr. Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, etc.

There were two influences, especially, which seemed to incline the reviewers to over-haste in accepting the new hypothesis; (1), an excessive confidence, based, indeed, on very remarkable and well-established data, in the power of Assyriology to solve all historical problems upon which it could be brought to bear; (2), the supposed confirmation of the literal, historic accuracy of Gen. II. which the new opinion afforded.*

The scholars of the Continent of Europe were far less complaisant. The new theory was everywhere discussed, and almost everywhere condemned. Assyriologists and Non-Assyriologists joined hands in assailing it. Only a few voices were heard in its favor, and those less in the way of careful defense, than in allusions and expressions of personal opinion.† In spite, however, of the strong objections brought against his theory, Professor Delitzsch is understood to maintain his ground, and this adds a further zest to the examination upon which we are about to enter. But before beginning it, it is important to distinguish three possible forms of fundamental inquiry: (1). Where was the Garden of Eden, *i. e.*, as a matter of fact and of history? (2). Where did the author of Gen. II., 8-14 think it was? (3). What has been the history of belief in regard to it, among ancient peoples? It is not meant that these questions do not have an intimate connection, and a direct bearing upon each other, but only that for purposes of scientific study a distinction must be made between them. In the present case it is the second form of the inquiry which is adopted,—that form which underlies Professor Delitzsch's work, in spite of his title, which points rather to (1)—and any light upon (1) or (3) which may be gained will be incidental and undesigned.

We are now ready to look at Delitzsch's hypothesis, which it will be convenient to state in the form of successive propositions:

* The former was illustrated by A. H. Sayce, *Academy*, Nov. 5, 1881; the latter by C. H. H. Wright, *Nineteenth Century*, Oct., 1882.—C. H. Toy, *Proceedings of Am. Oriental Soc.*, Oct., 1881, was much more cautious, and perceived the weak points of the hypothesis; my own notice in the *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., 1882, may be referred to, since its attitude is considerably modified in the following pages.—It should be said that (2), above, received no direct countenance from Professor Delitzsch himself.

† Among the more important criticisms were: In Germany, Th. Noeldeke, *Z. D. M. G.*, xxxvi., (1882) pp. 173-184; Fr. Philippi, *Theol. Lit.-Zeit.*, Apr. 8, 1882, Col. 147 sq.; J. Oppert, *Goettingsche Gel. Anzeige*, June 28, July 5, 1882, pp. 801-831.—France, J. Halevy, *Revue Critique*, Dec. 12-19, 1882, pp. 457-463, 477-485; Fr. Lenormant, *Les Origines de l'Histoire*, II., i., 1882, pp. 529-539.—Holland, C. P. Tiele, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Mar. 1882, pp. 258, sq.—Similarly, A. Dillmann, *Genesis*, 1882, pp. 57 sq., *Herkunft der Urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebraeer*, in *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, Apr. 27, 1882, transl. in *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1883; cf. K. Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, 1883, pp. 82, 270; E. Schrader, *KAT*, 1883, pp. 26 sq., 40 sq.—F. Hommel, however, *Augsb. Allgem. Zeitung*, 1881, Beil. 229-231, devotes ten columns to a hearty endorsement of Delitzsch's position, without, at all points, helping the cause by perfectly judicious argument.

I. *The writer conceived of the territory where the garden was as in existence in his own time, supposed himself to know its locality, and desired to communicate to his readers such knowledge as he had.* Par. pp. 2, 3, 44. The first statement and the last are undoubtedly true, witness the various details of the description,*—mostly unimportant for his narrative, and of use only as means of identification. It might be that the second statement was true only in a limited sense, *i. e.*, the degree of precision attaching to his conceptions of the locality is a matter for special consideration.

II. *Various details indicate that Eden was conceived as having a southern, tropical climate* (pp. 7 sq.); (1), that God walks in the garden “in the cool of the day,” (2), that fig-trees were available for girdles. To which may be added the fertility of the soil.—None of these, however, gives material for a definite conclusion as to locality. With the addition of irrigation, they would suit Arabia (Halevy) as well as Babylonia. Unfavorable to Babylonia,† if not conclusive against it,‡ is the use of fig-leaves, since the fig is rare in Babylonia.

III. *The analogy of other early narratives of Genesis, and favorable local conditions, point to Babylonia as the site of Eden* (pp. 45 sq.); *e. g.*, (1), the ark was doubtless built in the lowlands, and Babylonia is suitably near Eastern Armenia, where the ark rested; (2), the Land of Shinar was in Babylonia; (3), the names Tigris and Euphrates point to the same region; (4), the well-watered garden, and (5), the position of it “eastward” (*i. e.*, from Palestine.)§—No one could call these points conclusive. Granting (1) and (2), they prove nothing certainly to the point; (3) is adverse to Babylonia, since it is not in Babylonia that these rivers take their rise (see below); (4) and (5) suit Babylonia. Four of these particulars, then, may have

* It is not in conflict with this to say that the author is describing the region as it was in the earliest times. Vv. 8, 9 refer to the past; probably also עֵדֶן, v. 10 (So Del., Dillm., *Gen.*⁴, *ad loc.*,—otherwise *Gen.*³—Philippi, *loc. cit.*, etc. In that case עֵדֶן, also, would be historical Impfs.

† So Schrader, *KAT*², p. 38, Dillm. *Genesis*⁴, on iii., 7.

‡ Not conclusive—because it is not certain that there *never* were more fig-trees there than at present, or than in Herodotus's time. (Herod. i., 193). See also Ritter, *Erdkunde*, vii. 2, p. 541. (“.....selbst noch Bagdad.....bringt keine guten Feigen.”.....“Das wahre Feigenland beginnt erst mit dem mittlern und obern Tigris-und Euphratlande, mit Mesopotamien..... vorzueglich ist es aber auch hier nicht die Flaechе, sondern das Huegelland, oder vielmehr noch der eigentliche Klippenboden, in welchem der Feigenbaum sich wohlgefaellt.” The paper of Solms, cited by Dillm. *Genesis*⁴, p. 72, I have not been able to see.) And because, in any case, Delitzsch might be willing to modify his view so far as to suppose the Hebrew writer to transfer the tree of Palestine to the Garden of God.

§ This is the most likely interpretation of עֵדֶן, if it is genuine. See Dillm., who, however, cites Lagarde, *Genesis, graece*, (1868) Pref., p. 23 l., according to which the word was once lacking in Heb. and Syr. text.

weight in connection with positive evidence; one will have to be overcome by such evidence.

IV. *It is highly probable that the Babylonians had a legend of a Paradise, and of a Fall of Man, whose natural location would be Babylonia*; this is indicated by (1), the evidence of Babylonian accounts of Creation, Ten Patriarchs, and Flood, more or less distinctly parallel with the Hebrew accounts (pp. 84 sq.);* (2), a belief that Babylonia was the home of the first men (p. 92); (3), the "tree of life," constantly represented on Assyrian and Babylonian tablets, and probably, also, the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (p. 91); (4), the significant names *Kar* = (or *Gin* =) *Dunias*, for the district immediately about Babylon, and *Tintir*, for the city itself (pp. 64 sq., 136 sq.); (5), the Cherubim, believed to be known in Babylonia (pp. 92, 93, 150 sq.); (6), the consciousness of guilt among the Babylonians, and their attributing of suffering (in particular, the flood) to guilt, with the contrast between the excellence of the original creation, in which they believed, and the actual state of the world as they must have observed it (pp. 86, 145); (7), the activity of the dragon, or serpent, *Tiamat*, enemy of the gods, whom Merodach overcomes (pp. 87 sq., 147 sq.). —(1) affords a presumption, but nothing more, and the Flood-story is the only one of the three whose details can be satisfactorily compared with the corresponding Hebrew narrative; (2) is supported by the Babylonian localization of the Flood, and by the fact that Berossus makes Aloros, the first of the antediluvian kings, a Babylonian; (3) is admitted in its former statement, but the latter cannot be independently proved, since the only reason for holding to a Babylonian "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" is the peculiar form of the tree represented on the cylinder referred to below,—under (7)†; (4) the names "Enclosure of the god Duniash," and "Grove of Life" can give only general hints, no proof; (5) is possibly true, although the exact relation between the winged bulls (*Sedu* = *Kirubu*?) of Babylonia and Assyria, and the Hebrew conception of **כרובים** is still in dispute. But it was not the only office of the **כרובים** to guard the entrance to the lost Paradise, and their existence in Babylonia would not prove that they had this office there; (6) is a good argument, as far as it goes, but points less to a Paradise, i. e., a topographically defined garden of innocence and peace, than to the facts of consciousness; (7) is the most important of all, and must be carefully examined.

* See, however,—somewhat too skeptically adverse to any close connection between the Babylonian and the Hebrew stories,—Dillmann, *Urgeschichtliche Sagen der Hebräer*.

† Dillm., *Gen.*⁴ p. 49, maintains that this tree is peculiar to the Hebrew narrative; so K. Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 79. There is certainly no positive evidence as yet to the contrary.

This is clear, that, while the Babylonians, like the Hebrews, and other peoples, attached no necessarily bad idea to the notion of a serpent, but rather the contrary,* yet the representation of Tiamat (Chaos), who is commonly a dragon, when personified at all, is also sometimes a serpent, called by that name (*Par.* p. 89), and even so figured.† Delitzsch compares (p. 89), not without reason, *Rev.*, XII., 7-9, XX., 2 sq., and the *שר על-התהו* of the Kabbala. On the same page we have also a mention of the mutilated tablets which seem to connect Mero-dach's battle against Tiamat with the exhortations to men to fulfil their duties toward the gods. No certain conclusion, however, can at present be drawn from this. But Delitzsch lays the chief stress (p. 90), upon the famous little cylinder which bears a rude tree, with fruit hanging at each side, and two sitting figures, with long garments; the one at the right has horns on the head, the other a cap or turban, while behind him (her?) a serpent appears standing on its tail. The right hand of one figure and the left of the other are extended toward the tree, which rises between them.‡ That this naturally reminds the beholder of Gen. III. (so Baudissin, p. 291) can hardly be denied; that there is really a connection is not thereby demonstrated. Nothing proves the different sex of the sitting figures;¶ their long robes are not primitive, neither is their head-gear; their outstretched hands have the palm turned upward, and the fruit hangs below them. There is no sufficient reason from the form of the tree to distinguish it from the familiar "tree of life,"—(see above). If we were *sure* of the existence of the legend in Babylonia, these difficulties might be overcome, and supposed to depend partly on the rudeness or carelessness of the engraving, and partly on the transference of later habits (*e. g.*, the robes) to primitive times, partly perhaps (as in the case of the head-gear), on some unknown symbolism. But, with our present light, this interesting and striking scene can hardly be admitted as a definite proof of a Babylonian story of the Fall.§

And it must be clearly kept in mind that such a story would not

* See *Del. Par.*, pp. 87, 88, 146 sq., and cf. *Num.* xxi., 5-9; 2 *Kgs.* xviii., 14; also Dillm. on *Genesis*, iii., 1.

† See W. H. Ward, *The Serpent Tempter in Oriental Mythology*, *Bib. Sacra*, Apr., 1881, p. 224. Dr. Ward discovered the cylinder, here depicted, in the possession of the late Dr. S. Wells Williams; it was first published, after his impression, by A. H. Sayce, in *Geo. Smith's Chaldean Genesis*, 2d ed. (1880), p. 90.

‡ See, further, W. H. Ward, *l. c.*; A. H. Sayce, *l. c.*, p. 88; W. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, I., p. 258 sq.

¶ That the difference in head-gear does so (*Del.*), is surely very doubtful. The distinction between bearded and beardless (*Ward, l. c.*) would be better, but I am not able to convince myself that there is this difference between these two faces.

§ See criticisms of it by Tiele, and Budde, *l. c.*; cf. Menant, *Empreintes de cylindres Assyro-Chaldeen*, p. 48; Halevy, *l. c.*

necessarily bring with it a "garden of Eden," and that such a garden is the very thing of which we are in search. It might very well be that the *fact* of the Fall, and the manner of it, quite outweighed for the Babylonian priests, who would probably transmit the legend, the *place* of the Fall, and that the garden, with its river, dividing into four, might be entirely strange to them.

V. *Eden* (עֵדֶן) (1) *denoting a land distinct from other districts of similar name* (עֵדֶן 2 Kgs. XIX., 12 = Is. XXXVII., 12, Ezek. XXVII., 23, Am. I., 5) (p. 3 sq.), (2) *not an invented name* (land of *delight*) (p. 5 sq.), (3) *nor yet to be connected with Gin Dunias* (or Kardunias = Babylonia), (p. 65 sq.), (4) *may be explained by reference to Akkadian edin, Assy. edinu = Assy. serū, "field," "plain," "desert,"—originally "lowland," "depression,"* (p. 79 sq.), a name applicable to Babylonia.—(1) is at once admitted; (2) is, from the absence of אֵדֶן, in Gen. II., 8, and the apparent wish of the writer to define the locality, probably correct, at least to this extent, that whatever the meaning he attached to the word, he connected it with some particular part of the earth's surface; (3) is most likely, notwithstanding Sir Henry Rawlinson's high authority,—not so much on the ground proposed by Delitzsch, that *Kardunias* ("enclosure—garden?—of the God Dunias") would not explain אֵדֶן, since the "land" of Eden might result from a misapprehension,—but because *Gin-dun-i-sa* is a very late form (Asurbanipal, B. C. 668—), and still more because *Kardunias* itself is not traceable earlier than the Cossaeon dominion (B. C. 1500+)—see below; (4) gives a very plausible etymology, but there are several missing links in the argument which destroy its stringency: *a.* it is not proved that *edinu* was ever applied to Babylonia, or any part of it, as a proper name; *b.* it is not proved that *edin* = *serū* in the sense "depression," "lowland," and not rather simply in the sense "plain;" in that case the comparison of *Zor*, "depression," an Arab. name of Babylonia (Wetzstein, in Delitzsch *Fes.* 3. Ausg. p. 701) is much less significant.* On the other hand, it is not clear that the name might not have been applied to some level country, and the fact that it is elsewhere employed in the phrase *sabe edini*, "warriors of the steppe" would not hinder the derivation of עֵדֶן from *edin* (against Halevy, *l. c.*). But מִקְדָּם, "eastward," "to or in the East" is too general to point definitely to Babylonia, and it may well be questioned whether, if Babylonia had been in mind, the writer would not have used some better known designation, and, in any case, have omitted the phrase "in the East," which, by its very generality seems to imply a greater degree of igno-

* Against Delitzsch's comparison מִקְדָּם = דִּנְרָא (Dan. iii., 1), see Halevy, *l. c.*, p. 80.

rance (on the part of the writer or the readers,—one or both) than would have been possible in regard to Babylonia. That Babylonia was not north or west or south of them, the Hebrews surely knew. It needs no argument to show that there is a wide difference between using the term “East” with more or less definite application to a particular region, (*e. g.* ארץ קדם, Gen. XXV., 6, cf. XXIX., 1, Job I., 3, see *Par.* p. 46), and *adding* the same word, as a more particular definition to a proper name already expressed.*

VI. *The Pishon and Gihon were canals, or natural water-courses artificially enlarged*, (pp. 47 sq., 67 sq.); (1) *the Pishon = the Pallakopas*, which left the Euphrates to the west a little below Babylon, flowed into and through the “Chaldæan lakes,” past the ancient city of Ur (= Ur Kasdim, Gen. XI., 28, 31), and finally into the Persian Gulf; (2) the name Pishon (פִּישׁוֹן) might be connected with Assyr. *pisanu*, “water-holder,” (p. 77); (3) the Gihon = the *Shatt-en-Nil* (a comparatively modern name, ancient *Arahtu*) branching eastward from the Euphrates, at Babylon, flowing S.E., and returning after a hundred miles or so to the Euphrates again. The beds of these ancient streams are still traceable, for a considerable part of their extent; (4) the name Gihon (גִּיחוֹן) is explained by bilingual lists of Babylonian “canals” or streams, by the equivalents *Ka*-(or *Gu*)-*ga-an-de* = *Arahtu* (p. 75) on the supposition that *de* has here its meaning “flowing,” “irrigation,”—and is therefore a non-essential element, and that the stream *Ka*-(*Gu*)-*ga-an-na* which appears on another fragment, is the same with *Gugande*.—That these were once important streams is doubtless true, although we know too little of their course to speak with much certainty† of their value to the Babylonians, and the name Gihon is identified with some plausibility. That of Pishon = *pisanu* is guesswork.—But it must be reckoned an objection,—not perhaps insuperable—that while the rivers are enumerated presumably from a geographical standpoint, as first, second, etc., in the order Pishon, Gihon, Tigris, Euphrates, the proposed identifications would give Tigris,

* This argument falls the moment one adopts another interpretation for כְּקֶדֶם,—as “in the eastern part” of Eden, or rejects the word altogether,—see above.

† E. g. Arrian (Anab. Alex. vii., 21) says that the Euphrates, swollen by snows, would often flood the surrounding country, if the surplus water were not drawn off through the Pallakopas into lakes and swamps. Is there any evidence that the Pallakopas reached the Persian Gulf? Halevy (l. c.) maintains that it did not. The Greek of Arrian is as follows: [The Euphrates] ὑπερβάλλει ἐς τὴν χώραν, εἰ μὴ τις ἀναστομώσας αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐς τὰ ἔλη τε ἐκτρέψει καὶ τὰς λίμνας, αἱ δὲ ἀρχόμεναι ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς διώρυχος, ἐς τε ἐπὶ τὴν ξυνοχὴν τῇ Ἀράβων γῇ, καὶ ἐνθεν μὲν ἐς τέναγος ἐπὶ πολὺν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἐς θάλασσαν κατὰ πολλὰ τε καὶ ἀφανῆ στόματα ἐκδίδωσι.—But when the snow is gone, and the Euphrates has grown small, καὶ οὐδὲν μείον τὸ πολὺν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐκδίδοι ἐς τὰς λίμνας—Further: ἐπὶ τε τὸν Παλλακόπαν ἐπλενσε (l. e. Alexander), καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸν καταπλεῖ ἐς τὰς λίμνας, ὥς ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀράβων γῇ.

Gihon, Euphrates, Pishon; or Pishon, Euphrates, Gihon, Tigris.

VII. *The land Havilah, around which Pishon flows, is the eastern or northeastern part of the Syrian desert, west of the Euphrates and northwest of the Persian Gulf;* (pp. 57 sq.), favored by (1) the position of Havilah, Gen. x., 29, as last but one of the Joktanides, (2) Gen. xxv., 18, where it is the limit of the Ishmaelitish territory, see also 1 Sam. xv., 7; (3) the products attributed to Havilah, ch. II., 11, 12. —(1) and (2) are good reasons, especially (2);* (3) is disputed, but it is certain that Merodachbaladan, who ruled the shore of the Persian Gulf, is said to have sent as tribute, “gold, the dust of his land,” that Pliny (Nat. Hist. XII., § 35, [XIX]) speaks of bdellium (*Par.* pp. 16, 60) as a product of Babylonia, and that the *samtu*-stone belonged to the (Babylonian?) province Meluhha. There is no difficulty, then, in supposing either that gold, which was found in lower Babylonia, was also found in Havilah, across the Euphrates, or that Merodachbaladan actually ruled in Havilah, and that the gold he sent came from that region. Similarly it may be said of bdellium, that Havilah might be reckoned to Babylonia, as producing it, or that it is at all events not unlikely, that two closely adjoining territories had similar products. True, we do not *know* that כרלח (Gen. II., 12) is the *bdellium*, but our ignorance on this point cannot overcome the positive evidence as to the location of Havilah. In regard to שהם, if, as seems natural, it is to be identified with the *samdu*, or *samtu* (-*tu* = fem. ending) there is however the awkward circumstance that the *samtu* is mentioned expressly as a product of Meluhha, which is identified with Akkad = Northern Babylonia,—while Havilah would lie nearer to Southern Babylonia,—so that a similarity of product is in this case less easily inferred. Two or three other considerations must be added: (a) Havilah has here (Gen. II., 11) the article (החווילה), which makes the identification with חווילה of Gen. x., 29, xxv., 18, 1 Sam. xv., 7 less certain; (b) there is no evidence that Babylonians or Hebrews looked upon the region bordering the Persian Gulf and west of the Euphrates, as the land of gold and precious stones *par excellence*;† (c) while סוכך (Gen. II., 11, cf. 13) need not mean “encircling”‡ it is very doubtful whether it can mean “in leichtem Bogen durchfliessen” (*Del. Par.* p. 10), which would probably be necessary if the Pallakopas were the Pishon, and Havilah the territory here supposed; (d) this difficulty is greatly increased by the expression כל-ארץ החווילה, which is very emphatic and inclusive, so that, although the location of Havilah affords the most definite, posi-

* Cf. also Dillm., *Genesis*⁴, p. 58.

† Matt. ii., 1, 11, which Delitzsch adduces, furnishes no proof.

‡ See Dillm.. *ad loc.*

tive argument in behalf of Delitzsch's hypothesis that we have yet found, it is hampered by rather serious difficulties.

VIII. *Cush is not Ethiopia, but the land of Kassu in Babylonia*, cf. *Nimrod, son of Cush*, Gen. x., 8 sq. (pp. 51 sq., 127 sq.); (1) several of the descendants of Cush, in Gen. x., are not demonstrably the heads of African tribes, some of them certainly Asiatic; (2) the presence of Cushites in Babylonia is likely, from the mention of Nimrod; (3) the *Kassi*, Greek *Κισαιοι*, *Κοσσαιοι*, whose ancient home was in the mountains on the border of Media and Elam, had in early times a permanent settlement in Babylonia; (4) the name *Kaldu* applied by Asurnasirpal (9th cent. B. C.) to Babylonia,—being doubtless the Assyrian pronunciation of Babylonian *Kasdu* (Heb. כַּשְׁדִּים) is probably the same name, *Kassu*, with the ending *-du* (*-da*) "border," "territory."

—We have here a very difficult problem, not as yet susceptible of perfect solution.* As to (1), it may be agreed that, whether or not there is sufficient evidence of ethnological relationship between Asiatic tribes and the African Cush,† certain Asiatic tribes were, for some reason or other, associated with Cush; this would, however, be entirely compatible with the view that both Asiatic and African Cush are here included under the one name; (2) points on the face of it, to some, as yet obscure, connection of Nimrod with the Cushites elsewhere mentioned in the Bible, which nowhere else alludes to a Babylonian branch of Cush; (3) calls for several remarks: (a) Assyrian *Kusu*, (Bab. *Kusu*) is always applied to Ethiopia. Even if *Meluhha* denoted both Ethiopia and a Babylonian district, it would not, without evidence, follow that *Kusu* could be so employed. But any proof that the Hebrews located Eden in Babylonia would increase the unlikelihood of their using Cush in a non-Babylonian sense; (b) to meet this objection it is suggested‡ that כּוּשׁ, Gen. II., 13, x., 8, results from a misunderstanding of the narrator or editor, and that *Kas* (כַּשׁ) was the original form,—i. e. the Gihon skirted the land Kash, and Nimrod was a Kassite;¶ a possibility, especially in view of the probably late date of the *matres lectionis*, but possibility is not proof. In the present case there are grave objections to its reality. It is shown by Delitzsch (cf. Kossaeer, p. 62) that there were Kassites in Babylonia as early as 1525 B. C., when the Kassite dynasty began; there is no evidence of their being there earlier. De-

* Friedr. Delitzsch's recent work, *Die Sprache der Kossaeer*, Leipzig, 1884, makes some important contributions to the discussion,—see below.

† C. H. Toy, *Proceedings of Am. Oriental Soc.*, May, 1882, denies such relationship.

‡ Schrad. *KAT*², p. 87; favored by Delitzsch, *Kossaeer*, p. 61, N. 1, and see particularly Paul Haupt, *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 89. Hommel, also, *Allg. Zeit.* 1881, *Beil.* 229, p. 3354, maintains that Cush here refers to the Kassites.

¶ Haupt even calls his article, just cited, *The Language of Nimrod, the Kashite*.

litzsch distinctly abandons the idea that Hammurabi, a more ancient king of Babylon, was a Kassite (cf. Kossaeer, pp. 64, sq.). Was Nimrod not conceived of as earlier than this,—a time when Babylon, and all the famous old cities of its neighborhood were long established,—when Assyria had already its own, independent kings? And if the Babylonians so conceived of him, must not the Hebrews also, undoubtedly dependent on Babylonian accounts for events like those of Gen. x., 8 sq., have been well-informed? At all events, as far as at present appears, if Nimrod was a Kassite, we must give up the favorite hypothesis that Nimrod was the same with Izdubar. That name, whatever it means, has no Kassite marks, and all the evidences of Akkadian literary advancement, and Assyro-Babylonian dependence upon the Akkadians for poem and legend, stand in the way of a sudden transference to the wild, mountain-bred Kassite of any part of that stock of tradition or myth which the bi-lingual and uni-lingual tablets have preserved to us.* But if it is hard to suppose that Nimrod was, or was believed to have been, a Kassite, the argument is greatly weakened for the original reading נִשְׁ in Gen. 11., 13, as well; (c) there is little real evidence that Babylonia, and particularly the district south and southeast of Babylon was called *Kas*. Asurnasirpal, in his great inscription (I R. 23, Col. III. l. 17), in describing a Babylonian campaign, says that Sada-du, of the land of Zuhi, . . . trusted in the numerous forces of the land of the Kassite,† but its location is not further defined. Whether *Kasda* (II R. 53. 9a) refers to the land of the *Kassite* depends upon (4); under this head it is to be noticed that Asurnasirpal names the land *Kaldu*, in the same account (I R. 24. Col. III. 24) and the difference in form would, in the absence of other indications, point to a difference of meaning rather than to identity. Moreover, if Ur Kasdim was in Babylonia, then there are two fresh objections to Delitzsch's *Kas* = *Kasda* = נִשְׁ, for, in the first place, there is every probability that the Hebrew emigration (Abraham) from Ur took place before the 16th cent., B. C., while there is no ground to doubt that נִשְׁ belongs to the earliest form of the story, and further, since Ur = *Mugheir* is west of the Euphrates, *Kasda* would also be there, and not the Gihon, but the Pishon would flow through it.—Add, *mutatis mutandis*, what was said under VII. (c) and (d), and it will appear that there is at present

* Delitzsch thinks that he has proved that there is no linguistic relationship between Akkadians and Kassites (Kossaeer, pp. 40, 41). Certainly Haupt, (*loc. cit.* pp. 89—91, cf. Theoph. G. Pinches, *Journal R. A. Soc.*, Apr. 1884, p. 302), has not proved the contrary. His suggestion that Nimrod (נִמְרוֹד) is derived from the name of a Kossaeen god *Maraddas*, (= Adar), god of the chase (?) is as yet hypothesis.

† *ana ummanati mat Kassite rapsati ittakalma.*

considerably less evidence in favor of Delitzsch's Cush, than for his Havilah.*

IX. *The river of Gen. II., 10, which divided into the four, was the Euphrates, at the part where, above Babylon, it approaches the Tigris, with its system of watercourses flowing toward the Tigris, and including the Tigris as the eastern limit* (pp. 66 sq.); the "isthmus" between the two rivers was so intersected by these watercourses, as to make the impression of one great stream, in various channels.—This is perhaps the most ingenious and the weakest point of the argument. For, granting that Arrian (*Anab. Alex.* VII. 7, cited by Del. p. 67) is right in saying that the direction of the current of these watercourses was from the Euphrates toward the Tigris, and not the reverse,† and that they still retained the general direction of the Euphrates sufficiently to be thought part of the river, and that the Tigris really was regarded as, at this part, nothing more than the left border of the Euphrates, yet no Babylonian, or Hebrew familiar with Babylonia could suppose that the Euphrates with its canal-system, + the Tigris, was one river, nor could it occur to him to so represent it. The brief part of their course in which their waters were thus intermingled could not induce a writer to forget or ignore their wide separation above, nor,—whatever might be possible in the case of the Pishon and Gihon,—to suppose that the Tigris and Euphrates proper began where that many-channeled river ceased. Whether the Asshur before, (or east of), which the Tigris is said to flow is the city or the empire is here immaterial. But that any writer, with even a vague knowledge of the geography of the region could in one breath speak of the Tigris as a "head," i. e. new stream-beginning, starting from a river of Babylonia, and in the next, of the same Tigris as flowing past Asshur, is utterly incredible. Quite as incredible is it that the Hebrews, who, as all agree, knew something of the middle Euphrates, should utterly ignore that, and speak or write as if the Euphrates began its existence a few miles from Babylon.

Of all the propositions, then, in which I have endeavored to

* When, therefore, he says, (*Kossaeer*, p. 61).... "ists verwunderlich, dass das hebraeische Volk, dessen Gesichtskreis, was Babylonien und Assyrien betrifft, nicht ueber das 16. Jahrhundert zurueckreicht, wie ja die alte Reichshauptstadt Assur den Hebraeern unbekannt ist, ists verwunderlich dass das hebraeische Volk die babylonische Staatenbildung ueberhaupt auf כוש, dass es Nimrod, den Jaeger und Staedtegruender, zu einem Kuschiten oder besser Kossaeer macht? und gewinnt nicht die in meinem Werk ueber die Lage des Paradieses vorgetragene Ansicht, es moechte das כוש der Paradieserzaehlung von Babylonien zu verstehen sein und der Name Kasdim selbst mit diesem Volk Kassu im Zusammenhang stehen, mehr und mehr an Gewicht"—I must observe that in the preliminary sentence he draws too large a conclusion from his premises, and confess that his questions seem to call for answers the reverse of those which, by their form, they appear to look for.

† As Xenophon, *Anab.* I. 7, 15, says of the canals he saw.

formulate this brilliant, and at first sight attractive hypothesis, the only one which has any probative power is that relating to Havilah; that, however, is hampered by some difficulties of its own, and certainly cannot, in the presence of so much hypothetical and hostile evidence, bear the whole weight of the theory. The necessary conclusion is that Professor Delitzsch has not satisfactorily answered the question, Where did the conception of the Hebrew writer of Gen. II., 8-14 place Eden and its garden?

THE BLESSING OF Jael.

BY PROF. EDWARD L. CURTIS,
Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.

“Blessed above women be Jael
The wife of Heber the Kenite.
Above women in the tent blessed.
Water he asked, milk she gave.
In a dish of the nobles she offered him curds.
Her hand she outstretched to the tent pin,
And her right hand to the hammer of the workmen
And hammered Sisera, and smote his head,
And beat and struck through his temples.
Between her feet he bowed, he fell he lay,
Between her feet he bowed, he fell;
Where he bowed there he fell down slaughtered.”

Judges v., 24-27.

That the death of Sisera by the hand of Jael should hold a leading place in the song of Deborah is most natural. A fulfillment of the previous prophecy,¹ it was a grand vindication of the divine commission of the prophetess. Its praise also was to the just humiliation of the men of Israel who had hesitated when bidden to go forward, and to whose leader Deborah had been forced to say: “The journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honor.” Woman had been stronger than man, and to woman belonged the praise.

But, from a moral standpoint, what of the blessing of Jael? At first glance it appears like the commendation of a base assassination, especially when one reads the prose narration.² Let us consider it somewhat carefully.

Is the blessing with or without divine sanction? If we take the latter view, that these words are simply Deborah's, that the inspiration of the Book of Judges guarantees nothing more than a correct

¹ Judg. iv., 9. ² Judg. iv., 18-21.